

Louisville Journal

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
PRENTICE, HENDERSON, & OSBORNE
Green street, between Third and Fourth

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1866

We publish this morning the first part of an address to the Legislature of Kentucky from the pen of our distinguished townsmen the Hon. S. S. Nicholas. The rest of the address will appear in the next two or three numbers of the Journal.

Everything from the pen of Judge Nicholas is worthy of the best consideration of his countrymen, but, in our judgment, the production under notice is especially worthy of such consideration. The Fall elections have put the North in the attitude of demanding what the South will not concede. In other words, the elections have brought the country to a deadlock. How can this be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

This question Judge Nicholas answers. And we believe that his answer is the true one. As, however, it is not developed in the part of the address which we publish today, and as we would not willingly anticipate his masterly argument, we for the present content ourselves with commanding the entire address to the thoughtful attention of the public. No paper of the time has presented stronger claims to the public attention.

The Associated Press has dismissed its agent and employed a new one.

This change as we understand it, is mainly a private affair, having little or no relation to the patriotic aims of the association. We do not understand that the change is intended to affect the quality or quantity of the news dealt out to the press of the country. This we regret, because such a change is needed, and the occasion favors it.

We do not think it in good taste or good judgment that the Courier on the day before the arrival of Gen. Hanson's mortal remains chose to set forth, in an editorial article, meant to correct any misconception in regard to those invited to take an active part in the reception, that the invitation was confined to "all and every one who ever fought under the banner which Gen. Hanson has left in his upholding, or who sympathized with the cause for which he fought his last battle," who might be his personal friends.

We can see no reason why the invitation was not given to all who either fought under the Confederate flag or not or sympathized with the Confederate cause or not or were Gen. Hanson's personal friends or acquaintances or not, who might be disposed to render an appropriate tribute to the memory of a gallant soldier and eminent citizen of Kentucky. We believe that many of those who have been ever loyal to the banner of the Union would gladly, if invited, have taken part in the solemn ceremonial.

There is no way to enforce the obligation. Will not the association voluntarily discharge the obligation? If the association is honorable and wise it will. It has got rid of an unfaithful agent. That is good. Now let it put an end to its own unfaithfulness. That will be better.

We have nothing to do with the private relations between the association and its agents, but with the relations between the association and the press of the country we have much to do and more to suffer. And the occasion invites the expression of our sufferings.

The coloring of the news is perhaps the gravest and most insidious evil in the case. By this transgression the Associated Press has become a powerful engine of party. The despots of the association in the guise of political importance, enter nearly every household in the land, they enter the majority of households every morning, they give the earliest version of the matter they broach they are generally read in the state of mental and moral relaxation which offers slight resistance or no resistance to positive influences, and they are all that most persons ever do read touching the current events of the day. And these despots are systematically and thoroughly partisan. The news disseminated by the association is collected and concocted in the interest of the radical party. The association is virtually a grand propaganda of radicalism.

And a most efficient system of propaganda could hardly be imagined. Certainly a more efficient system would not be tolerated by a people with our spirit of manly spirit. It is as if there were posted in every family a confidential inmate whose special business was to indoctrinate the members in radical principles, employing for the purpose the entire resources of a propaganda extending not merely over the whole country, but from one end of the world to the other. The might of the system is immeasurable. It is fearful.

Such is the Associated Press as it is now managed. It is, as we have said, a powerful engine of party. It is the most powerful engine of party. No other is equal to it. It beats the plenum. It overtops the pulpit. It cuts out the press. We do not hesitate to say that it exerts a party influence greater than the united influence of all the radical journals in the Union. It is insidious. It is subtle. It is unscrupulous. It is all-powerful. It is all-embracing. Its seat of power is on the threshold of opinion. It drags the fountains of political intelligence. It biases men without their knowledge. It works upon them in the midst of their household gods. It sways the public mind from the fireside.

Let me write the songs of a people, said Fletcher of Saltonstall, and I care not who makes the laws. Let me write the news of a people, and we care not who edits the journals. The Associated Press, through its agents, writes the news of the people of the United States. And the news as those agents write it, is a radical travesty of the facts.

The conservative press pays the association forty or fifty thousand dollars a year for the privilege of publishing what is in effect the advanced sheet of the radical journals.

This evil is insatiable. It is rarely high that the evil were corrected. Why shall it not be corrected at once?

The Associated Press has, it is now managed. It is, as we have said, a powerful engine of party. No other is equal to it. It beats the plenum. It overtops the pulpit. It cuts out the press. We do not hesitate to say that it exerts a party influence greater than the united influence of all the radical journals in the Union. It is insidious. It is subtle. It is unscrupulous. It is all-powerful. It is all-embracing. Its seat of power is on the threshold of opinion. It drags the fountains of political intelligence. It biases men without their knowledge. It works upon them in the midst of their household gods. It sways the public mind from the fireside.

Let me write the songs of a people, said Fletcher of Saltonstall, and I care not who makes the laws. Let me write the news of a people, and we care not who edits the journals. The Associated Press, through its agents, writes the news of the people of the United States. And the news as those agents write it, is a radical travesty of the facts.

The conservative press pays the association forty or fifty thousand dollars a year for the privilege of publishing what is in effect the advanced sheet of the radical journals.

This evil is insatiable. It is rarely high that the evil were corrected. Why shall it not be corrected at once?

The Associated Press has, it is now managed. It is, as we have said, a powerful engine of party. No other is equal to it. It beats the plenum. It overtops the pulpit. It cuts out the press. We do not hesitate to say that it exerts a party influence greater than the united influence of all the radical journals in the Union. It is insidious. It is subtle. It is unscrupulous. It is all-powerful. It is all-embracing. Its seat of power is on the threshold of opinion. It drags the fountains of political intelligence. It biases men without their knowledge. It works upon them in the midst of their household gods. It sways the public mind from the fireside.

Let me write the songs of a people, said Fletcher of Saltonstall, and I care not who makes the laws. Let me write the news of a people, and we care not who edits the journals. The Associated Press, through its agents, writes the news of the people of the United States. And the news as those agents write it, is a radical travesty of the facts.

The conservative press pays the association forty or fifty thousand dollars a year for the privilege of publishing what is in effect the advanced sheet of the radical journals.

This evil is insatiable. It is rarely high that the evil were corrected. Why shall it not be corrected at once?

The Associated Press has, it is now managed. It is, as we have said, a powerful engine of party. No other is equal to it. It beats the plenum. It overtops the pulpit. It cuts out the press. We do not hesitate to say that it exerts a party influence greater than the united influence of all the radical journals in the Union. It is insidious. It is subtle. It is unscrupulous. It is all-powerful. It is all-embracing. Its seat of power is on the threshold of opinion. It drags the fountains of political intelligence. It biases men without their knowledge. It works upon them in the midst of their household gods. It sways the public mind from the fireside.

Let me write the songs of a people, said Fletcher of Saltonstall, and I care not who makes the laws. Let me write the news of a people, and we care not who edits the journals. The Associated Press, through its agents, writes the news of the people of the United States. And the news as those agents write it, is a radical travesty of the facts.

The conservative press pays the association forty or fifty thousand dollars a year for the privilege of publishing what is in effect the advanced sheet of the radical journals.

This evil is insatiable. It is rarely high that the evil were corrected. Why shall it not be corrected at once?

The Associated Press has, it is now managed. It is, as we have said, a powerful engine of party. No other is equal to it. It beats the plenum. It overtops the pulpit. It cuts out the press. We do not hesitate to say that it exerts a party influence greater than the united influence of all the radical journals in the Union. It is insidious. It is subtle. It is unscrupulous. It is all-powerful. It is all-embracing. Its seat of power is on the threshold of opinion. It drags the fountains of political intelligence. It biases men without their knowledge. It works upon them in the midst of their household gods. It sways the public mind from the fireside.

Let me write the songs of a people, said Fletcher of Saltonstall, and I care not who makes the laws. Let me write the news of a people, and we care not who edits the journals. The Associated Press, through its agents, writes the news of the people of the United States. And the news as those agents write it, is a radical travesty of the facts.

ROBERT L. MAITLAND & CO.,
General
Commission
Merchants &
Bankers,
No. 1 Hanover Buildings, Hanover Square,
NEW YORK.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1866

We sincerely regret that any treason or disloyalty or ill feeling less grown up between the editors of the Courier and a local editor of the Journal in the reception at this place of the remains of the lamented General Hanson. It must we think, exist a feeling of grief in the minds of all good citizens, that one unpleasant word has been spoken or one disagreeable thought entertained upon such an occasion. In the presence of the mouldered ashes of the brave and noble dead, the spirit of meanness and strife should stand rebuked and silent.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

Everything from the pen of Judge Nicholas is worthy of the best consideration of his countrymen, but, in our judgment, the production under notice is especially worthy of such consideration. The Fall elections have put the North in the attitude of demanding what the South will not concede. In other words, the elections have brought the country to a deadlock.

How can this be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor or affronting the pride of either, and what is a most vital consideration, without inflicting an immeasurable wound upon the Constitution? This is a great question. It is a noble question. It is the question of questions in the politics of our country.

We are thinking that it is unjust on the part of the Courier to speak of what may have been said in the local editions of the Journal as indicating our party's political course. All that we can do is to instruct our local editors, as we have often done, not to trench at all upon politics or upon issues supposed to be pending between those who opposed and those who strove to uphold the Southern Confederacy. How can this step be broken up, and the sections reconciled, without tarnishing the honor

